



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/944,216 | 09/04/2001 | David Wilcox | 36735-174429 | 2635 |

26694 7590 12/02/2004

VENABLE, BAETJER, HOWARD AND CIVILETTI, LLP
P.O. BOX 34385
WASHINGTON, DC 20043-9998

| |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

STEVENS, ROBERT

| | |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

2176

DATE MAILED: 12/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/944,216

Applicant(s)

WILCOX ET AL.

Examiner

Robert M Stevens

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 September 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 04 September 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-19 are pending in Application No. 09/944,216, entitled "Conceptual Content Delivery System, Method and Computer Program Product", filed 9/4/2001 by Wilcox et al. Claims 1, 2, 10, 11 and 19 are independent.

2. No Information Disclosure Statement has been filed as of the date of this communication.

Priority

3. Applicant claims benefit of provisionally filed application number 60/229,315 (filed 9/1/2000).

Specification

4. Applicant is reminded of the proper content of an abstract of the disclosure.

A patent abstract is a concise statement of the technical disclosure of the patent and should include that which is new in the art to which the invention pertains. If the patent is of a basic nature, the entire technical disclosure may be new in the art, and the abstract should be directed to the entire disclosure. If the patent is in the nature of an improvement in an old apparatus, process, product, or composition, the abstract should include the technical disclosure of the improvement. In certain patents, particularly those for compounds and compositions, wherein the process for making and/or the use thereof are not obvious, the abstract should set forth a process for making and/or use thereof. If the new technical disclosure involves modifications or alternatives, the abstract should mention by way of example the preferred modification or alternative.

The abstract should not refer to purported merits or speculative applications of the invention and should not compare the invention with the prior art.

Where applicable, the abstract should include the following:

- (1) if a machine or apparatus, its organization and operation;
- (2) if an article, its method of making;
- (3) if a chemical compound, its identity and use;
- (4) if a mixture, its ingredients;
- (5) if a process, the steps.

Extensive mechanical and design details of apparatus should not be given.

5. Abstract exceeds the 150 word limit and refers extensively to purported merits
6. The disclosure is further objected to because of the following informalities:

A. Applicant is reminded to please correct all spelling/grammatical/etc. mistakes throughout the specification (including the claims and drawings). By way of example, please refer to [00054] "to be innovated ongoing", which appears to be a grammatical error.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

7. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

8. **Claim 19 is rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph**, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Regarding independent claim 19, no implementation details were provided as to how to render a pie-shaped interface (lines 3-6).

9. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

10. **Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph**, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding independent claim 1, there is a lack of antecedent basis as to "said plurality of authors" in lines 10-11.

Further regarding independent claim 1, the scope is vague and indefinite. The phrases "time consuming" (line 19; based upon what criteria?) and "relating to" (line 36; how related?) are vague. Additionally, in lines 51-64 JavaScript keyword "var" (used in

JavaScript to declare/define variables) is used to label a type of file and a type of code, rendering its meaning vague and ambiguous.

Claims 4 ("time consuming"), **5** ("relates to"), **8-9** (use of "var") and **17-18** (use of "var") recite the same limitations as those discussed re: claim 1 above, and therefore are likewise rejected.

Claim 10 is substantially similar to claim 1, and therefore likewise rejected.

Regarding independent claim 2, there is a lack of antecedent basis as to "said plurality of authors" in lines 4-5.

Claim 11 is substantially similar to claim 2, and therefore likewise rejected.

Claims 3-9 and 12-18 are dependent upon claims 2 and 11, respectively, and therefore likewise rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

11. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States

Art Unit: 2176

only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

12. **Claims 2-3, 5-7, 11-12 and 14-16 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e)** as being anticipated by Baffes et al (US Patent No. 6,292,792, filed Mar. 26, 1999 and issued Sep. 18, 2001, hereafter referred to as "Baffes").

Regarding independent claim 2, Baffes discloses:

A method for extracting, organizing, and providing access to conceptual information, comprising:

a) editing and aggregating conceptual content information; (col. 7 lines 10-12 and col. 7 lines 39-48)

b) organizing said conceptual content information from said plurality of authors in an adaptable extensible framework supporting a plurality of information object terms; (col. 7 lines 48-58, re: sales person and col. 8 lines 60-64)

c) optimizing said conceptual content information for user access at a computing device into optimized conceptual content information; (col. 7 lines 48-58 re: "concept delivery", in context of col. 7 lines 32-35 [where knowledge base = database. Note that the MS Dictionary defines a database as a file composed of records on p. 123) and

d) delivering said optimized conceptual content information to a user at said computing device. (col. 7 lines 55-58)

Regarding claim 3, which is dependent upon claim 2, Baffes further discloses:

wherein said step (a) comprises at least one of:

1) isolating conceptual content information from raw textual content information; (col. 7 lines 10-12)

2) aggregating related conceptual content information; (col. 7 lines 39-48)

3) organizing said conceptual content information; (col. 7 lines 39-48)

4) structuring said conceptual content information; (col. 8 lines 53-51)

5) retaining verbatim original language of said plurality of authors;
(This limitation requires an editor to do nothing. Therefore, refer to col. 9 lines 59-62, re: deleting information, wherein the amount of information deleted by an editor is 0 [none]) *and*

6) adding links and keywords. (col. 6 lines 4-7 and col. 8 lines 51-52)

Regarding claim 5, which is dependent upon claim 2, Baffes further discloses:

wherein said step (b) comprises:

1) organizing said conceptual content information wherein said conceptual content information relates to professional fields including at least one of work, business, and research. (col. 7 lines 48-58, re: sales person and col. 8 lines 60-64)

Regarding claim 6, which is dependent upon claim 2, Baffes further discloses:

wherein said information object terms can be selected from a group comprising at least one of a type, a concept, a keyword, a suite, a table of contents (TOC), a publisher, an author function, an author, a section, an extract, a component, and a title. (col. 7 lines 48-58, re: concept)

Regarding claim 7, which is dependent upon claim 2, Baffes further discloses:

wherein any first information object term of said plurality of information object terms is related to a second information object term of said plurality of information object terms as identified in a term table database (col. 7 lines 32-35) *and a linkage table database.* (col. 6 lines 4-7, in context of col. 9 line 67- col. 10 line 3 re: object linkage)

Independent claim 11 is directed to a system which implements the method of claim 2. As such, claim 11 is substantially similar to claim 2, and therefore likewise rejected.

Claim 12 is substantially similar to claim 3, and therefore likewise rejected.

Claims 14-16 are substantially similar to claims 5-7, respectively, and therefore likewise rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

13. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

14. **Claims 1 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being unpatentable over Baffes et al (US Patent No. 6,292,792, filed Mar. 26, 1999 and issued Sep. 18, 2001, hereafter referred to as "Baffes") in view of Cooper et al. (US Patent No. 6,101,503, filed Mar. 2, 1998 and issued Aug. 8, 2000, hereafter referred to as "Cooper") and further in view of David Flanagan (JavaScript: The Definitive Guide, 3rd Edition, O'Reilly & Associates, Inc., Sebastopol, CA, Jun. 1998, pp. 10-11, 102, 207-216, 267-271, 358-359 and 640-642, hereafter "Flanagan"). Note that the Microsoft

Computer Dictionary, 4th Edition (Microsoft Press, Redmond WA, (c) 1999, pp. 123, 266 and 461, hereafter "MS Dictionary") has been used to supply the definitions of "database" and "URL".

Regarding independent claim 1, Baffes discloses:

A method for extracting, organizing, and providing access to conceptual information, comprising:

- a) editing and aggregating conceptual content information comprising at least one of:*
 - 1) isolating conceptual content information from raw textual content information; (col. 7 lines 10-12)*
 - 2) aggregating related conceptual content information; (col. 7 lines 39-48)*
 - 3) organizing said conceptual content information; (col. 7 lines 39-48)*
 - 4) structuring said conceptual content information; (col. 8 lines 53-51)*
 - 5) retaining verbatim original language of said plurality of authors; (This limitation requires an editor to do nothing. Therefore, refer to col. 9 lines 59-62, re: deleting information, wherein the amount of information deleted by an editor is 0 [none])*
 - 6) adding links and keywords; (col. 6 lines 4-7 and col. 8 lines 51-52)*
 - 7) ... ; [See Cooper discussion, below]*
 - 8) establishing a conceptual overview of raw textual content data; (col. 7 lines 39-48)*
 - 9) ... ; [See Cooper discussion, below]*
 - 10) performing a negative pass to remove time consuming content; (col. 9 lines 59-62, re: deleting information)*
 - 11) identifying and isolating said conceptual content information passages; (col. 7 lines 10-12)*
 - 12) extracting said conceptual content information passages and identifying said conceptual content information passages by a top level concept (col. 7 lines 39-40, re: "broad concept") and an information object term; (col. 7 lines 39-40, re: the term "computer")*
 - 13) proofreading and editing said conceptual content information passages; (col. 12 lines 51-55, re: "editing")*
 - 14) performing a final edit of said conceptual content*

Art Unit: 2176

information passages; (col. 12 lines 51-55, re: "editing")

15) adding graphic images to said conceptual content information; (col. 8 lines 64-67, re: "video") and

16) linking said conceptual content information to a plurality of information object terms; (col. 6 lines 4-7)

b) organizing said conceptual content information from said plurality of authors including information relating to professional fields including at least one of work, business, and research, in an adaptable extensible framework supporting a plurality of information object terms, (col. 7 lines 48-58, re: sales person and col. 8 lines 60-64)

wherein said information object terms can be selected from a group comprising at least one of a type, a concept, a keyword, a suite, a table of contents (TOC), a publisher, an author function, an author, a section, an extract, a component, and a title; (col. 7 lines 48-58, re: concept) and

wherein any first information object term of said plurality of information object terms is related to a second information object term of said plurality of information object terms as identified in a term table database (col. 7 lines 32-35) and a linkage table database; (col. 6 lines 4-7, in context of col. 9 line 67- col. 10 line 3 re: object linkage)

c) optimizing said conceptual content information for user access at a computing device into optimized conceptual content information (col. 9 line 67- col. 10 line 5 re: "simplify usage") comprising:

1) reading a record of said conceptual content information; (col. 7 lines 48-58 re: "concept delivery", in context of col. 7 lines 32-35 [where knowledge base = database. Note that the MS Dictionary defines a database as a file composed of records on p. 123])

2) ... ; [See Flanagan discussion, below]

3) preassociating said conceptual content information, including following parent/child links and accessing any associated objects; (col. 6 lines 4-7)

4) ... ; [See Flanagan discussion, below]

5) storing JavaScript VARs in an optimized database; (Databases store files/records. Fig 3 #11, 13, 15 and 46 use of database) and

6) ... ; [See Flanagan discussion, below] and

d) delivering said optimized conceptual content information to a user at said computing device, (col. 7 lines 55-58) comprising:

1) receiving a request for a content page of said optimized

Art Unit: 2176

conceptual content information from a browser; (col. 10 lines 29-35 re: request from user via browser and request for a particular topic)

2) reading JavaScript include file including JavaScript VAR statements from said optimized database; (col. 12 line 63 – col. 13 line 7 discloses reading from a knowledge base [i.e., an optimized database])

3) ... ; [See Flanagan discussion, below]

4) ... ; [See Flanagan discussion, below] and

5) ... ; [See Flanagan discussion, below].

However, Baffes does not explicitly disclose:

a) ...

...

7) extracting conceptual content information from a plurality of authors;

...

9) tagging positive locations in said raw textual content data of conceptual content information passages;

...

Cooper, though, discloses:

a) ...

...

7) extracting conceptual content information from a plurality of authors; (Fig 2 #255)

...

9) tagging positive locations in said raw textual content data of conceptual content information passages; (Fig 2 #240)

...

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Cooper for the benefit of Baffes, because to do so would allow a programmer to present document concepts to a user, as taught by

Cooper in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the incorporation of conceptual information into electronic documents.

Additionally, Baffes does not explicitly disclose:

c) ...

...

2) *determining whether said record is a main object and if so then creating JavaScript variable (VAR) tile for a main object and content is placed in said JavaScript VAR file;*

...

4) *adding JavaScript VAR code for said any associated objects;*

...

6) *writing JavaScript file to JavaScript to include directory of web server; and*

d) ...

...

3) *transmitting said JavaScript to said browser;*

4) *transmitting a JavaScript function rendering library to said browser; and*

5) *transmitting a page layout and formatting to said browser for rendering said content page at said browser.*

Flanagan, though, discloses:

c) ...

...

2) *determining whether said record is a main object and if so then creating JavaScript variable (VAR) tile for a main object and content is placed in said JavaScript VAR file; (p. 102, var used to declare variables)*

...

4) *adding JavaScript VAR code for said any associated objects; (p. 102, used of var statement)*

...

6) *writing JavaScript file to JavaScript to include directory of*

web server; (p. 215 12.2.2 1st paragraph re: use of URL [which specifies a server and directory of a resource location as evidenced by the MS Dictionary in the p. 461 definition of URL) and

d) ...

...

3) transmitting said JavaScript to said browser; (pp. 10-11 section 1.41 re: Control Document Appearance and Content discussing JavaScript and browser)

4) transmitting a JavaScript function rendering library to said browser; (p. 642 Packages.netscape section discussion on use of the JavaScript class library netscape.javascript) and

5) transmitting a page layout and formatting to said browser for rendering said content page at said browser. (pp. 10-11 section 1.41 re: Control Document Appearance and Content discussing JavaScript and browser)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Flanagan for the benefit of Baffes in view of Cooper, because to do so would allow a programmer to control which web pages are displayed in a browser, as taught by Flanagan in the 3rd paragraph under p. 11 section 1.4.2 "Control the Browser". These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., web programming.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Baffes, Cooper and Flanagan because these references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., web programming.

Independent claim 10 is directed to a system, which implements the method of claim 1. As such, claim 10 is substantially similar to claim 1, and therefore likewise rejected.

15. **Claims 4 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being unpatentable over Baffes et al (US Patent No. 6,292,792, filed Mar. 26, 1999 and issued Sep. 18, 2001, hereafter referred to as "Baffes") in view of Cooper et al. (US Patent No. 6,101,503, filed Mar. 2, 1998 and issued Aug. 8, 2000, hereafter referred to as "Cooper").

Regarding claim 4, which is dependent upon claim 2, Baffes further discloses:

wherein said step (a) comprises at least one of:

- 1) ... ;*
- 2) establishing a conceptual overview of raw textual content data;*
(col. 7 lines 39-48)
- 3) ... ;*
- 4) performing a negative pass to remove time consuming content;*
(col. 9 lines 59-62, re: deleting information)
- 5) identifying and isolating said conceptual content information passages; (col. 7 lines 10-12)*
- 6) extracting said conceptual content information passages and identifying said conceptual content information passages by a top level concept (col. 7 lines 39-40, re: "broad concept") and an information object term; (col. 7 lines 39-40, re: the term "computer")*
- 7) proofreading and editing said conceptual content information passages; (col. 12 lines 51-55, re: "editing")*
- 8) performing a final edit of said conceptual content information passages; (col. 12 lines 51-55, re: "editing")*
- 9) adding graphic images to said conceptual content information;*
(col. 8 lines 64-67, re: "video") and

10) linking said conceptual content information to a plurality of information object terms. (col. 6 lines 4-7)

However, Baffes does not explicitly disclose:

1) extracting conceptual content information from a plurality of authors;

...

3) tagging positive locations in said raw textual content data of conceptual content information passages;

...

Cooper, though, discloses:

1) extracting conceptual content information from a plurality of authors; (Fig 2 #255)

...

3) tagging positive locations in said raw textual content data of conceptual content information passages; (Fig 2 #240)

...

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Cooper for the benefit of Baffes, because to do so would allow a programmer to present document concepts to a user, as taught by Cooper in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the incorporation of conceptual information into electronic documents.

Claim 13 is substantially similar to claim 4, and therefore likewise rejected.

16. **Claims 8-9 and 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being unpatentable over Baffes et al (US Patent No. 6,292,792, filed Mar. 26, 1999 and issued Sep. 18, 2001, hereafter referred to as "Baffes") in view of David Flanagan (JavaScript: The Definitive Guide, 3rd Edition, O'Reilly & Associates, Inc., Sebastopol, CA, Jun. 1998, pp. 10-11, 102, 207-216, 267-271, 358-359 and 640-642, hereafter "Flanagan"). Note that the Microsoft Computer Dictionary, 4th Edition (Microsoft Press, Redmond WA, (c) 1999, pp. 123, 266 and 461, hereafter "MS Dictionary") has been used to supply the definitions of "database" and "URL".

Regarding claim 8, which is dependent upon claim 2, Baffes further discloses:

wherein said step (c) comprises at least one of:

1) *reading a record of said conceptual content information;* (col. 7 lines 48-58 re: "concept delivery", in context of col. 7 lines 32-35 [where knowledge base = database. Note that the MS Dictionary defines a database as a file composed of records on p. 123])

2) ... ;

3) *preassociating said conceptual content information, including following parent/child links and accessing any associated objects;* (col. 6 lines 4-7)

4) ... ;

5) *storing javascript VARs in an optimized database;* (Databases store files/records. Fig 3 #11, 13, 15 and 46 use of database) and

6)

However, Baffes does not explicitly disclose:

wherein said step (c) comprises at least one of:

1) ... ;

2) *determining whether said record is a main object and if so then creating javascript variable (VAR) file for a main object and content is placed in said javascript VAR file;*

3) ... ;

- 4) *adding javascript VAR code for said any associated objects;*
- 5) *... ; and*
- 6) *writing javascript file to javascript to include directory of web server.*

Flanagan, though, discloses:

wherein said step (c) comprises at least one of:

- 1) *... ;*
- 2) *determining whether said record is a main object and if so then creating javascript variable (VAR) file for a main object and content is placed in said javascript VAR file; (p. 102, var used to declare variables)*
- 3) *... ;*
- 4) *adding javascript VAR code for said any associated objects; (p. 102, used of var statement)*
- 5) *... ; and*
- 6) *writing javascript file to javascript to include directory of web server. (p. 215 12.2.2 1st paragraph re: use of URL [which specifies a server and directory of a resource location as evidenced by the MS Dictionary in the p. 461 definition of URL])*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Flanagan for the benefit of Baffes, because to do so would allow a programmer to control which web pages are displayed in a browser, as taught by Flanagan in the 3rd paragraph under p. 11 section 1.4.2 "Control the Browser". These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., web programming.

Regarding claim 9, which is dependent upon claim 2, Baffes further discloses:

wherein said step (d) comprises at least one of:

- 1) *receiving a request for a content page of said optimized conceptual content information from a browser; (col. 10 lines 29-35 re: request from user via browser and request for a particular topic)*

- 2) *reading javascript include file including javascript VAR statements from said optimized database;* (col. 12 line 63 – col. 13 line 7 discloses reading from a knowledge base [i.e., an optimized database])
- 3) ... ;
- 4... ; and
- 5... .

However, Baffes does not explicitly disclose:

wherein said step (d) comprises at least one of:

- 1) ... ;
- 2) ... ;
- 3) *transmitting said javascript to said browser;*
- 4) *transmitting a javascript function rendering library to said browser; and*
- 5) *transmitting a page layout and formatting to said browser for rendering said content page at said browser.*

Flanagan, though, discloses:

wherein said step (d) comprises at least one of:

- 1) ... ;
- 2) ... ;
- 3) *transmitting said javascript to said browser;* (pp. 10-11 section 1.41 re: Control Document Appearance and Content discussing JavaScript and browser)
- 4) *transmitting a javascript function rendering library to said browser;* (p. 642 Packages.netscape section discussion on use of the JavaScript class library netscape.javascript) *and*
- 5) *transmitting a page layout and formatting to said browser for rendering said content page at said browser.* (pp. 10-11 section 1.41 re: Control Document Appearance and Content discussing JavaScript and browser)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Flanagan for the benefit of Baffes, because to do so would allow a programmer to control which web pages are displayed in a browser, as taught by Flanagan in the 3rd paragraph under p. 11 section 1.4.2 "Control the Browser".

These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., web programming.

Claims 17-18 are substantially similar to claims 8-9, respectively, and therefore likewise rejected.

17. **Independent claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being unpatentable over Lamping, John, et al. ("Visualizing Large Trees Using the Hyperbolic Browser", CHI '96, Apr. 13-18, 1996, pp. 388-389, hereafter "Lamping") in view of Junkin (US Patent No. 6,493,717, provisionally filed Jun. 16, 1998, hereafter referred to as "Junkin").

Regarding independent claim 19, Lamping discloses:

*A graphical user interface for user access to three or more levels of organizational hierarchy of content topics (p. 388 Fig. 1) comprising:
a pie-shaped interface comprising a plurality of pie slices wherein each pie slice of said pie-shaped interface represents a high level topic for user interaction; (p. 388 Fig. 1 and 1st paragraph under "Introduction" section)
wherein upon user-selection of any of said plurality of pie slices (p. 389 Fig. 2), ... , and
...*

However, Lamping does not explicitly disclose:

... , a plurality of medium level topics are displayed for user interaction, and

wherein, in turn, upon user-selection of any of said plurality of medium level topics, a plurality of low level topics are displayed for user interaction.

Junkin, though, discloses:

... , a plurality of medium level topics are displayed for user interaction, (Fig. 10, especially selection of "Sweets" topic displays "Product New" topics) and

wherein, in turn, upon user-selection of any of said plurality of medium level topics, a plurality of low level topics are displayed for user interaction. (Fig. 10, especially selection of "Product New" topic displays a lower level list of product topics)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Junkin for the benefit of Lamping, because to do so would allow for the management of a database using a browser, as taught by Junkin in col. 2 lines 37-39. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the display of information hierarchies.

Conclusion

18. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Non-patent Literature

Ford, Nigel, Web Developer.com Guide to Building Intelligent Web Sites with JavaScript, Wiley Computer Publishing, New York, NY, © 1998, pp. 80-83, 247-252, 261-266 and 320.

Bradenbaugh, Jerry, JavaScript Application Cookbook, O'Reilly & Associates, Inc., Sebastopol, CA, Oct. 1999, pp. 147-148 and 165-174.

| <i>US Patents</i> | |
|--------------------------|-----------|
| Ambroziak | 6,415,319 |
| Smith, III | 6,772,139 |
| Pasquali | 6,272,493 |
| Cragun | 6,177,936 |
| Hugh | 6,166,739 |
| Ferrel et al | 6,584,480 |
| Caid et al | 6,173,275 |
| Liddy et al | 6,026,388 |
| Chang et al | 6,578,046 |
| Anick et al | 6,519,586 |
| Baer et al | 6,449,627 |
| Lenk et al | 6,366,923 |
| Lore et al | 6,163,774 |
| Wishnie et al | 6,148,311 |
| Li et al | 5,911,138 |
| Lu et al | 5,819,260 |
| Caid et al | 5,619,709 |
| Atkinson | 5,701,424 |

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert M Stevens whose telephone number is (571) 272-4102. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:00 - 2:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H. Feild can be reached on (571) 272-4090. The current fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306. Additionally, the main number for Technology Center 2100 is (571) 272-2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Robert M. Stevens
Art Unit 2176
Date: November 15, 2004

rms

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Sanjiv Shah", with a stylized flourish at the end.

SANJIV SHAH
PRIMARY EXAMINER